

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 25-29 have been added without introducing new matter.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-20 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Iwata et al. (US Patent No. 6,009,338) (hereinafter Iwata) in view of Eromaki Marko et al., (EP 1 051 012 A2) (hereinafter Marko). Applicants respectfully traverse in view of the following.

Independent Claim 1 recites a module for performing an operation based on a selection of information displayed on a display, and wherein the operation is based on content of the selection of information displayed on the display, as claimed. Accordingly, an operation is performed based on making a selection of the content regarding information displayed, and is therefore content sensitive. For example, the sliding component can select an action to “call Peter” when the sliding component is under the “call Peter” item that is being displayed.

In contrast, Iwata discloses a location detector for detecting a location of the slide cover (see Iwata, col. 5, lines 55-56). Iwata further discloses a display switch that changes the size of the display area and a display direction according to the location of the slide cover (see Iwata, col. 5, lines 56-59).

Accordingly, Iwata discloses detecting the location of the slide cover to change the size of the display area. Detecting the location of the slide cover, as disclosed by Iwata, changes the size of the viewable portion of a display without selecting information displayed on a display, as claimed. For example, sliding the cover may mask a portion of the information being displayed, thereby reducing the size of the viewable portion of the display, as disclosed by Iwata, without selecting information, as claimed.

As presented and discussed above, changing the size of the viewable portion of a display by sliding the cover fails to show any selection of information. Thus, changing the size of the display is based on the location of the slide cover and not based on a content of selected information displayed on the display, as claimed. For example, sliding the cover may mask/unmask information being displayed as determined by the location of the sliding cover that is independent from the content being displayed, as disclosed by Iwata.

The rejection admits that Iwata fails to teach that the sliding component is operable to accept at least one button input from a user, as claimed. The rejection relies on Marko. Applicants respectfully submit that Marko fails to remedy the failures of Iwata, as presented and discussed above.

Applicants respectfully submit that one would not be motivated to combine Iwata and Marko. Marko discloses a keyboard that slides relative to the body of the device (see Marko, Figures 14 and 15, element KB2). The keyboard accepts user input. Use of a keyboard as a protective shield exposes the keyboard and electronics therein to damage, e.g., damage from dropping the device, etc. In contrast, Iwata discloses that “the present invention” relates to the structure of a cover for protecting an input display unit for a portable electronic apparatus (see Iwata, col. 1, lines 17-20). Therefore, the rejection’s assertion that “there is no where Iwata disclosed the slider cover serves as the protective shield as one of his seven embodiments,” is incorrect because Iwata in the “background of the invention” on the very first page on column 1, lines 17-20 explicitly discloses the purpose of the invention in Iwata is to be a protective shield.

Accordingly, the slider cover, as disclosed by Iwata serves as a protective shield for the electronic apparatus. As such, using the keyboard, as disclosed by Marko, as a protective shield, as disclosed by Iwata, exposes the keyboard and electronics therein to damage resulting from its use as a protective shield. Thus, using the keyboard of Marko to modify the sliding cover of Iwata renders the intended purpose of the protective shield of Iwata inoperable since it exposes the electronics within the keyboard to damage resulting from its use as a protective shield. Therefore, one would not be motivated to modify Iwata according to the teaching of Marko to realize the claimed embodiments.

Accordingly, Iwata alone or in combination with Marko fails to render independent Claim 1 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Independent Claim 8 and 25 recite limitations similar to that of Claim 1 as presented and discussed above. For example, Claims 8 recites invoking an operation related to a content of the selected portion of the information, as claimed. Claim 25 recites performing an operation associated with the graphical element based on a content of the graphical element, as claimed. Thus, independent Claims 8 and 25 are patentable over the cited combination for similar reasons. Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

Independent Claim 16 recites generating a visual output on the display that is arranged and repositioned to be viewable in response to a relative position of a sliding component, as claimed.

In contrast, Iwata discloses detecting a location of the slide cover for changing a size of the display area (see Iwata, col. 5, lines 55-57). Changing the size of the display area, as disclosed by Iwata, fails to teach or suggest that the visual objects are arranged and repositioned to be viewable in response to the relative position, as claimed.

Applicants do not understand Marko to remedy the failures of Iwata with respect to independent Claim 16, as presented and discussed above. As such, Iwata alone or in combination with Marko fails to render independent Claim 16 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency. Independent Claim 25 recites limitations similar to that of Claim 16, as presented and discussed above. For example, Claim 25 recites that the processor is operable to reposition the plurality of graphical elements responsive to the position of the sliding component with respect to the display, as claimed. As such, independent Claim 25 is further patentable over the cited combination for reasons similar to that of Claim 16.

As per Claim 2, the rejection asserts that a display switch for changing the size of the display area is considered as the visual configuration action. Applicants respectfully disagree. For example, a cover may mask a portion of a display, thereby reducing the viewable size. However, the content being rendered is not being reconfigured, as claimed, but merely being masked by a slider cover, as disclosed by Iwata. As such, Iwata fails to teach or suggest that the operation is a visual configuration of data rendered on the display, as claimed.

As per Claim 3, Iwata discloses a telephone keyboard for dialing and an electronic note keyboard for character data input keys (see Iwata, col. 1, lines 36-

42). Iwata further discloses that the telephone mode and electronic note mode are based on the output from a cover switch that detects an open/close status of the cover (see Iwata, col. 1, lines 43-45). Iwata fails to teach or suggest that the telephone mode and electronic note mode are based on a selection of information displayed on the display, as claimed. As such, Iwata fails to teach or suggest the operation in the claimed fashion. As such, Iwata fails to teach or suggest the operation is an initiation of communication with another device using said wireless transmitter, as claimed.

As per Claim 4, Applicants respectfully submit that Iwata fails to teach or suggest the operation in the claimed fashion for reasons similar to that of Claim 3, as presented and discussed above. As such, Iwata fails to teach or suggest that the operation is an initiation of communication with an external device, as claimed.

Claims 8-10 recite limitations similar to that of Claims 1-3 and are patentable for similar reasons.

As per Claim 11, Iwata discloses first and second software that share information for a telephone operation (see Iwata, col. 7, lines 33-35). Iwata further discloses a third piece of software that enables access to the shared information (see Iwata, col. 7, lines 36-38). Iwata discloses that the electronic

device may be used as a telephone when the door is in a closed position (see Iwata, col. 7, lines 39-43). Sharing of information between the first and the second software and obtaining access to the shared information using a third piece of software, as disclosed by Iwata, fails to either teach or suggest a display of related additional information for the portion of the information, as claimed.

The rejection asserts that the Examiner believes that “if the action is telephone the information related to telephone is displayed or if the action is word processing the information related to word processing is displayed.” Applicants respectfully submit that the assertion by the rejection is not supported by the disclosure in Iwata. For example, if the action involves a telephone and the information is related to a telephone, as alleged by the rejection, then the information related to the telephone is not additional information, as claimed but rather the only information. As such, Iwata fails to teach or suggest the recited limitation.

As per Claim 12, Iwata discloses a switch that is used to detect the close/open position of the sliding cover (see Iwata, col. 12, lines 48-53 and Figure 2, element 9). Detecting a close/open position of a sliding cover, as disclosed by Iwata, fails to either teach or suggest selecting a portion of the information that is being displayed, as claimed. As such, Iwata fails to teach or suggest that the selection is via a key, in the claimed fashion.

Claims 16-20 recite limitations similar to that of Claims 8-11 and are patentable for similar reasons.

Claim 7 is rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Iwata, Marko and in view of Uusimäki Matti (EP 1 107 101 A2) (hereinafter Matti). Applicants respectfully traverse in view of the following.

Claim 7 depends from independent Claim 1. Matti fails to teach or suggest the limitations of independent Claim 1. As such, Claim 7 is patentable over the combination of by virtue of its dependency. Claim 7 is further patentable in view of the following.

As presented and discussed above, the intended purpose for having a slide cover is its use as a protective shield, as disclosed by Iwata. Thus, modifying the teachings of Iwata such that the slide cover contains electronic components, e.g., input key, renders the intended purpose of the slide cover as a protective shield inoperable since the use of input key as a protective shield exposes the input key to damage therefrom. Accordingly, one would not be motivated to combine Matti with Iwata and Marko.

Claim 14 is rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Iwata in view of Marko, and further in view of Hansen et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,625) (hereinafter Hansen). Applicants respectfully traverse in view of the following.

Claim 14 depends from independent Claim 8. Hansen fails to teach or suggest the limitations of independent Claim 8. As such, Claim 14 is patentable over the combination of Iwata, Marko and Hansen by virtue of its dependency.

As presented and discussed above, the intended purpose for having a slide cover is its use as a protective shield, as disclosed by Iwata. Thus, modifying the teachings of Iwata such that the slide cover contain electronic components, e.g., microphone, renders the intended purpose of the slide cover as a protective shield inoperable since the use of microphone as a protective shield exposes the input key to damages therefrom. Accordingly, one would not be motivated to combine Hanson with Iwata and Marko.

As such, allowance of Claims 1-20 and 25-29 is earnestly solicited.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 and 25-29 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 and 25-29 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: October 10, 2008

/Amir A. Tabarrok/
Amir A. Tabarrok
Registration No. 57,137

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile